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**Extended abstract**

As Consumer-Based Brand Equity (CBBE) positively associates with brand positioning, competitive advantage, brand extensions and brand performance, it has received extensive interests from the academic and business community in retailing (Aaker 1991; Çifci et al. 2016). Using Aaker’s (1991) and Keller’s (1993) brand equity models, scholars such as Yoo and Donthu (2001) introduce measurement scales for assessing CBBE. However, many of these measures are applied to goods dominant brands (Jung and Sung 2008; Yoo and Donthu 2001; Punj and Hillyer 2004). Nam, Ekinci, and Whyatt (2011) argue that the existing measurement scales based on Aaker’s (1991) and Keller’s (1993) CBBE models are not suitable for service-dominant brands because of the inherent characteristics of services: intangibility, perishability, heterogeneity and inseparability (Grönroos 1984). Previous applications of Aaker's CBBE model to service organizations display poor validity (e.g. Boo, Busser, and Baloglu 2009). Some of the brand equity dimensions seem to differ for services. Although Aaker (1991) states that perceived quality is one-dimensional, services marketing scholars argue that service quality is multi-dimensional (Grönroos 1984). Nam, Ekinci, and Whyatt (2011) show that service quality is formed with two dimensions: physical quality and staff behavior. Furthermore, Aaker's (1991) CBBE model focuses mainly on the functional aspects of brands and ignores the brand’s symbolic consumption that is an essential component of brand equity. To address this deficiency, Nam, Ekinci, and Whyatt (2011) introduce three symbolic consumption related brand equity dimensions: self-congruence, brand identification and lifestyle-congruence. Their empirical study support validity of their model in the UK hospitality industry, but their findings are limited to only hotel and restaurant brands. Hence, there is uncertainty as to whether their findings are valid when the CBMB model is applied to other service sectors and different cultures.

This study’s aims are twofold. Firstly, to assess the external validity of Yoo and Donthu's (2011) and Nam, Ekinci, and Whyatt’s (2011) brand equity model and retail brand equity model in the retail industry in Spain. Spain was chosen because Spanish culture is collectivist and different from the U.K and U.S, where the previous brand equity models
had been developed and tested. Secondly, to advance Nam, Ekinci, and Whyatt’s (2011) CBBE model by introducing brand awareness and brand trust. Hence, this study differs from previous studies by comparing the validity of the two prominent CBBE models in a new setting and culture.

The results show that validity of the Retail Brand Equity and Nam, Ekinci, and Whyatt’s model are better than Yoon and Donthu’s CBBE model. Trust plays an important role in predicting brand loyalty. This reinforces and expands Delgado-Ballester and Munuera-Aleman’s (2005) study that trust is important in building brand loyalty for retailers, particularly for retailers that focus on high-involvement product (i.e. fashion).
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